REMARKS

Claims 1 through 8 and 21 through 24 are in the application, with claims 1, 4 through 7, 21 and 23 having been amended, and claims 9 through 20, 25, and 26 having been cancelled. Claims 1, 21, and 23 are the independent claims herein. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Objection

The Abstract has been amended in response to the Examiner's helpful suggestion. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections

Claims 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Claims 1, 5 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claims 1 through 5 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0007624 ("Handel"). Claims 1 through 3 and 21 through 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,136,913 ("Linderman"). Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Handel. Claims 9-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0083482 ("Makagon"). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

§112 Rejections

Claims 9, 14, 17, 25, and 26 have been cancelled. Claim 1 has been amended to overcome the objection to claims 1 and 5 in response to the Office Action. Withdrawals of the §112 rejections are respectfully requested.

§102/§103 Rejections

Claims 1, 21, and 23

Amended independent claim 1 describes a method of communicating with a computer telephony integration server that comprises transmitting a request from a client to a web server via a firewall and receiving a first response from the web server. The response may comprise a computer telephony integration applet that encodes information in extensible markup language and places the encoded information in a simple object access protocol formatted message. The method further comprises transmitting a message via the computer telephony integration applet and the firewall to a computer telephony integration sever using a hypertext transfer protocol, and receiving a second response from the computer telephony integration server.

The art of record cannot be seen to disclose or to suggest the above-mentioned features of amended independent claim 1. In particular, the art of record cannot be seen to disclose receiving a first response from a web server at a client where the response comprises a computer telephony integration applet where the computer telephony integration applet encodes information in extensible markup language and places the encoded information in a simple object access protocol formatted message.

Handel discloses administration of a call center where interfaces are converted from a protocol into SOAP using XML and are subsequently converted back into the protocol. As stated at [0053], a server application or application, respectively, handles the communication coordination between the client 30 and the network application 28, the servers 24 or the agent terminals 32. However, nowhere does Handel disclose that the communication is handled by a applet.

Therefore nowhere can Handel be seen to disclose or to suggest receiving a first response from a web server at a client where the response comprises a computer telephony integration applet where the computer telephony integration applet encodes information in extensible

markup language and places the encoded information in a simple object access protocol formatted message.

Linderman discloses a SOAP communication protocol for sending messages from one object to another across the Internet but 1) fails to disclose computer telephony integration and 2) fails to disclose an applet sent directly to a user. As stated at column 5, lines 10 through 25, a network management agent ("NMA") will forward or receive messages to/from a read/write server ("RWS") and messages will always be routed from or to the RWS. Furthermore, at column 10, lines 2 through 6, Linderman discloses that an applet to drive a user request is provided to the application source by a web server on a first side of a firewall and sent to a RWS provided on a second side of the firewall. Therefore, Linderman discloses an applet being sent from a first server to a second server (i.e. the RWS) and doesnt disclose that the applet is sent directly to a user or a network management agent.

Therefore, nowhere can Linderman be seen to disclose or to suggest receiving a first response from a web server at a client where the response comprises a computer telephony integration applet where the computer telephony integration applet encodes information in extensible markup language and places the encoded information in a simple object access protocol formatted message.

The remaining art of record has been reviewed and is not seem to remedy the foregoing deficiencies in Handel and Linderman. Therefore, the art or record taken in any permissible combination cannot be seen to disclose or to suggest receiving a first response from a web server at a client where the response comprises a computer telephony integration applet where the computer telephony integration applet encodes information in extensible markup language and places the encoded information in a simple object access protocol formatted message.

In view of the foregoing, amended independent claim 1 and its related dependent claims are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Amended independent claims 21 and 23 recite similar limitations. In view of the foregoing, amended independent claims 21 and 23 and their related dependent claims are therefore also believed to be in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

The outstanding Office Action presents a number of characterizations regarding the applied references, some of which are not directly addressed by this response. Applicants do not necessarily agree with the characterizations and reserve the right to further discuss those characterizations.

For at least the reasons given above, it is submitted that the entire application is in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience. Alternatively, if there remains any question regarding the present application or any of the cited references, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of the present application, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned via telephone at (203) 972-4982.

Respectfully submitted,

July 6, 2007
Date

/Richard S. Finkelstein/
Richard S. Finkelstein
Registration No. 56,534
Buckley, Maschoff & Talwalkar LLC
Attorneys for Intel Corporation
50 Locust Avenue
New Canaan, CT 06840
(203) 972-4982